

Appl. No 10/700,435

Amdt. Dated

Reply to Office action of 08/10/2004

5

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification has been rewritten in a proper idiomatic English as required, and the substitute specification contains no new matter.

Claims 1-5 have been appropriately amended.

10 The Examiner said that the present invention is rejected as being unpatentable over Jackson et al (US Patent 5456957) in view of Byrd et al (US Patent 4496184). However, the applicant couldn't agree more on this conclusion, and the reasons are explained as follows:

15 First, the shell structure in accordance with the present invention stresses on the function for enabling the consumers to replace the outer shell of the electrocar easily by themselves.

20 Second, the shell structure in accordance with the present invention further comprises inner shell which is used to shell the inner structure of the electrocar, the outer shell and the inner shell are provided with very simple-structured coupling so as to enable the consumers to replace the outer shell easily by themselves.

Third, Jackson et al and Byrd et al disclose an outer member which is detachable to a frame, however, they are not designed to enable the consumer to replace the outer member by themselves in a quick and easy way.

Fourth, in terms of the industrial field, the present invention is related particularly to the electrocar (including the electric wheelchair). The velocity of the electrocar is relatively slow, accordingly, the required structural strength of the detachable shell structure is weaker than that of the vehicles whose velocity is much greater than that of the electrocar. The present invention is particularly designed to enable the consumers to replace the outer shell quickly.

Fifth, so far, there are no any electrocars, electric wheelchairs designed to have a quick-release shell structure, except the present invention.

Sixth, the devices disclosed by Jackson and Byrd et al all relate to detachable structures which are similar to the structure of the present invention. However, their design notions are totally different from the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

Charles E. Baxley

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20, 149

90 John Street, Third Floor

New York, New York 10038

Telephone 212-791-7200

Facsimile 212-791-727